

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 17:36:36 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #152  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 18 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 152

Today's Topics:

    11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (3 msgs)  
        High speed Morse code requirement  
        No-Code Stupidity  
        No Code Debate (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 20:53:33 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!  
r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78KE1.31J@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)  
writes:

>r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
>: In article <C78Evt.M7z@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:

>: >r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>: >

>: I never said that i've "seen it all" I said that I've seen both ends  
>: of the spectrum. There's a bit of a difference.

>

>No, but you clearly implied that you had seen vastly more than Todd and  
>that your view was somehow more wide ranging than Todd's. The whole point  
>being that if you aren't implying that you've seen it all neither was

>Todd. Therefore my assertion that your posting asserted you had some vast  
>knowledge base that the rest of us are not privy to is at least as valid  
>as your assertion regarding Todd's experiences. Apparently Todd has also  
>seen BOTH ENDS OF THE SPECTRUM how else could he make such comparisons.

Well, my friend, I wasn't making any assumption as to whether or not  
Todd was qualified to make such comments, I was merely pointing out  
that I had experience in both fields, and that I felt that I was  
qualified to make my own judgement. Please point out to me where I  
put myself over Todd by saying that I had more experience. Find  
any examples? I didn't think so.

>: >: fights. I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebody's signal  
>: >: and stick pins in their coax. Never once have I seen that such actions  
>: >: the HF bands. Sure there's the occasional pileup, and people can be  
>:  
>: >You've NEVER seen such activity on HF? Well I guess you haven't seen it all.  
>:  
>: Please cite to me when you have seen one amateur locate another's  
>: signal just for the sheer enjoyment of shorting their coax. I've  
>: NEVER seen it.  
>  
>I assumed you were careful with your words. My mistake. I thought that  
>when you used the plural form of action that you meant more than just the  
>one activity of coax shorting.

Well, it's great to have an English teacher on the net, but please  
reread my post. I was asking him to cite ONE example, hence the  
singular form. Had I asked him to cite NUMEROUS examples, I would  
have used the plural. Remember... ONE = SINGULAR, MANY = PLURAL.

>: Well Dan, it is my personal belief that the ARRL is an organization  
>: whose purpose is based primarily on money. Therefore, I am not a  
>: member, and I am not subscribed to QST, and I do not have the  
>: information you request. I don't know when the last NAL was given  
>: for the purpose that you stated, but I can only assume that  
>: such reprimands are not given all too often because of the  
>: subjectivity of that particular law.  
>  
>I didn't realize that QST was the only source for NAL information. Nor  
>did I realize that you were at liberty to discuss the possibility of rule  
>enforcement but I wasn't at liberty to ask about the validity of your  
>statement.

>Nice try at slipping digs at the ARRL into your post.

Well, once again you have taken my post out of context. I was

merely stating my own PERSONAL beleif of the ARRL's purpose, not trying to knock it down. I'm sure thousands of people approve of the ARRL, but that's their own opinions, and I'm not accusing them of belonging to a money hungry organization.

Nice try at a lame flame. Please try to use a little bit of common sense next time, Dan.

Ron Fussell  
N1HIB

---

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 22:22:36 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r\_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
: In article <C78KE1.31J@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:  
: >r\_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
: >: In article <C78Evt.M7z@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:  
: >: >r\_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
: >: >  
: >: I never said that i've "seen it all" I said that I've seen both ends  
: >: of the spectrum. There's a bit of a difference.  
: >  
: >No, but you clearly implied that you had seen vastly more than Todd and  
: >that your view was somehow more wide ranging than Todd's. The whole point  
: >being that if you aren't implying that you've seen it all neither was  
: >Todd. Therefore my assertion that your posting assreted you had some vast  
: >knowledge base that the rest of us are not privy to is at least as valid  
: >as your assertion regarding Todd's experiences. Apparently Todd has also  
: >seen BOTH ENDS OF THE SPECTRUM how else could he make such comparisons.  
:  
: Well, my friend, I wasn't making any assumption as to wether or ont  
: Todd was qualified to make such comments, I was merely pointing out  
: that I had experience in both feilds, and that I felt that I was  
: qualified to make my own judgement. Please point out to me where I  
: put myself over Todd by saying that I had more experience. Find  
: any examples? I didn't think so.

Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it



lackk of knowledge regarding NAL's. I do read QST and have no idea about the actual correlation between license class and NAL issuance.

: Nice try at a lame flame. Please try to use a little bit of common  
: sense next time, Dan.

How is suggesting that you slipped a dig at the ARRL into a post a flame.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 23:15:08 GMT  
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
oz.plymouth.edu!r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78u5o.99r@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>: >No, but you clearly implied that you had seen vastly more than Todd and  
>: >that your view was somehow more wide ranging than Todd's. The whole point  
>: >being that if you aren't implying that you've seen it all neither was  
>: >Todd. Therefore my assertion that your posting asserted you had some vast  
>: >knowledge base that the rest of us are not privy to is at least as valid  
>: >as your assertion regarding Todd's experiences. Apparently Todd has also  
>: >seen BOTH ENDS OF THE SPECTRUM how else could he make such comparisons.

>:

>: Well, my friend, I wasn't making any assumption as to whether or not  
>: Todd was qualified to make such comments, I was merely pointing out  
>: that I had experience in both fields, and that I felt that I was  
>: qualified to make my own judgement. Please point out to me where I  
>: put myself over Todd by saying that I had more experience. Find  
>: any examples? I didn't think so.



>: >Nice try at slipping digs at the ARRL into your post.  
>:  
>: Well, once again you have takne my post out of context. I was  
>: merely stating my own PERSONAL beleif of the ARRL's purpose, not  
>: trying to knock it down. I'm sure thousands of people approve of the  
>: ARRL, but that's their own opinions, and I'm not accusing them of  
>: belonging to a money hungry organization.  
>  
>That is exactly what I thought you meant and I was trying to use it in  
>context. My point, which you obviously missed, was that there are  
>certainly other sources of the information aside from QST. And there is  
>no reason to give a diatribe on your beliefs about the ARRL to defend your  
>lackk of knowledge regarding NAL's. I do read QST and have no idea about  
>the actual correlation between license class and NAL issuance.

Point taken.

>: Nice try at a lame flame. Please try to use a little bit of common  
>: sense next time, Dan.  
>  
>How is suggesting that you slipped a dig at the ARRL into a post a flame.

I was suggesting that your entire post was a lame flame. Perhaps  
flame was an innapproiate word, how about a lame argument. You are  
picking apart my words, quoteing me out of context, and using  
arguments based on your own feelings. All in all, your arguments hold  
no clout. I would appricate it if you would be more objective in  
future posts.

This thread has taken a turn so I will resstate my origional  
argument. 11 meters is less mature, ruder, and overall less  
professional than the rest of HF. If anyone would like to continue  
thread on that subject, that is fine. As for us, Dan, our little  
argument holds no ground here in this group, and I suggest we move it  
to e-mail in order to conserve the bandwith.

Ron  
N1HIB

-----  
Date: 18 May 93 17:53:28  
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!  
vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Boy, this is a rather long lived code/nocode debate. They usually

burn themselves out much sooner than this. I haven't been following this thread so I may be restating something that has been said before. If I am, then I apologise for taking your time.

I will mention "Morse code" and "high speed Morse code". Please note that they are intentionally different.

I believe that the high speed Morse code requirement has little correlation to the intelligence of the operator. I know folks that are fluent high speed Morse code operators and those that are not. I've read posts from both sides of the issue as well. Nothing that I've seen or heard has convinced me that either side has the greater overall level of wisdom. Indeed, some of the arguments are shamefully infantile. (I don't follow the flame war because I'm embarrassed by association.)

I believe that the high speed Morse code requirement has little relevance in this age of high speed digital and analog video communications.

Before I'm branded as a heretic, let me say that I believe that high speed Morse code is a fine mode of operation. It has numerous benefits, but it also has its disadvantages. Like many other things in this world, there isn't a "one size fits all" solution. I actually enjoy using Morse code, in fact, all my HF contacts save a dozen or so have been via Morse code.

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 00:00:47 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Tom, is there some reason why no-code technicians cannot simply be HAPPY  
>with the class of license they earned, rather than constantly bitching  
>about how unfair the system is? Personally, I'm really sick of listening  
>to them whine about this topic. If one wishes to upgrade, there's a  
>system in place for them to do that. If they don't want to upgrade,  
>that's fine, too.  
>... But it takes effort and determination to advance in the  
>amateur ranks, and if they are unwilling to put forth that effort, they  
>will not upgrade. It's that simple. In real life, hard work and  
>dedication is rewarded by a pay raise, advancement, and greater  
>responsibility. The same is true in amateur radio.

Welp, Robert, you can thank the United States Welfare-State Mentality.



It's finally creeping into Amateur Radio.

```
#define NASAL_WHINE    ON
```

```
"waaaaaaaaa! Why should I have to know code to use HF? Its an outdated mode  
anyway! waaaaaaaaa!"
```

```
#define NASAL_WHINE    OFF
```

I'm sure you're familiar with that state of mind. Bitch, moan, and complain about something long enough and eventually someone will give it to you just to get you to shut the hell up.

MD

```
--  
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ           / Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,  
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net  / these opinions generally  
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz       / reflect those of my  
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347            / company...
```

-----

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 20:54:57 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No Code Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

njohnson@sysad.cnede.iastate.edu (Neil Johnson) writes:

: I'm currently a Technician Class operator (a no coder).

:

: I plan to learn code (I have most of the alphabet down now)

: and upgrade to at least General before the year ends.

:

: I will personally feel a great sense of accomplishment for achieving

: something that required effort and self-discipline.

:

: It will be a feeling that nobody can take away from me.

:

: I had the same feeling when I finished my first computer program.

: I had the same feeling when I got my B.S. in Computer Engineering.

: I had the same feeling when I got my yellow, then orange belt in Tae Kwon Do.

: I had the same feeling when I was recognized for being an outstanding first  
: year Jaycee.

: I had the same feeling when I passed my no-code exam.

:

: I believe that's what this debate finally comes down to; Whether or not code is

a

: technical requirement or part of the personal challenge of becoming a HAM.

No, it is accepted to be a part of the personal challenge of becoming a ham. The question is not the position of morse code on the hobby but rather if that position is still valid. There was a time when it was a necessary tool to ham communication now it is a personal challenge. When it was a tool that one needed to communicate nobody questioned it. Now that there is really no NEED for code some people feel that it should be kept around and others think it should be scrapped or changed.

: I feel it is a personal challenge.

It is. good luck with it.

: Even if the code-requirement is no-longer required for HF priveleges, I will still

: take pride in having put the effort into learning Morse code.

Enjoy code. It is good to know that there are still people around who want to keep this form of communication around. I think everyone, on both sides of the debate is happy to see these slower modes of communication around. Don't worry, I'm sure that CW will be around for along time and I don't see it ever being outlawed.

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

-----  
Date: 18 May 1993 23:01:42 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No Code Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78nu2.HGv@news.iastate.edu>

njohnson@sysad.cnede.iastate.edu (Neil Johnson) writes:

[describes anticipated ecstasy at passing code test]

>I will personally feel a great sense of accomplishment for achieving  
>something that required effort and self-discipline.

>It will be a feeling that nobody can take away from me.

>I had the same feeling when I finished my first computer program.

>I had the same feeling when I got my B.S. in Computer Engineering.

>I had the same feeling when I got my yellow, then orange belt in Tae Kwon Do.

>I had the same feeling when I was recognized for being an outstanding  
>first year Jaycee.

>I had the same feeling when I passed my no-code exam.

So, Neil, these are great feelings! As a matter of fact, they are  
so great that I think we should amend the Federal statutes to  
mandate that \*everyone\* experience them! OK, maybe not the BS in CE.  
Too many of those types running around nowadays anyway. But for the  
rest of the folks, tell them to \*stop whining\* and join the Jaycees!

: -) (for the humor-impaired)

Jim, W5GYJ

-----

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 00:01:57 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No Code Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

> NOW this guy has a good attitude about the whole thing. Too bad  
>the other no-code techs don't take after this gentleman's example

Ditto. Clearly another fine amateur in the makings.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Dignan, KD1HZ	/	Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net	/	these opinions generally

-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz / reflect those of my  
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347 / company...

-----  
Date: (null)

From: (null)

If I were asked to restructure the licensing scheme I would propose one where the other contemporary modes were given a priority equal to the priority currently given to high speed Morse code. That is, I believe that a restructured licensing exam would require an equivalent amount of knowledge of a more contemporary operating mode. By requiring an applicant to demonstrate competence in a technical mode we show by implication the importance of that mode.

If, say, 20% of the applicants were required to demonstrate intimate knowledge of amateur television then I believe we'd have many more ATV operators as a result. We could even have ATV networks passing information across the nation much the same as the current messaging systems do with packet. Folks will apply the things they know. If they know high speed Morse code better than they know ATV then they are that much more likely to use high speed Morse code and forgo the ATV experimentation until years later, if at all. (Yes, I'm guilty.)

However...

There is an international agreement that requires knowledge of Morse code to operate below 50 MHz and the U.S. licensing structure is not likely to change in the next couple of years.

I therefore suggest that folks accept the way things are but continue to work Through the system to affect a change.

Arguing and complaining do nothing but divide the amateur radio community. I'd like to think that we're above that kind of behavior. Let's get on with life and deal with some real issues. Issues like promoting amateur radio, increasing the technical level of the operators, sharing DF information, making a better cup of coffee....

Thanks for the use of the soap box.

--

Val Breault - N80EF - vbreault@gmr.com \ /|  
Instrumentation dept GM NAO R&D Center \ / |  
My opinions are not necessarily those of \ /\_\_|  
GMR nor of the General Motors Corporation \ / |\_\_\_

-----

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 23:48:47 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!  
r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May18.205333.27432@oz.plymouth.edu>, <C78u5o.99r@ucdavis.edu>,  
<1993May18.231508.7190@oz.plymouth.edu>  
Subject : Re: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)

In article <1993May18.231508.7190@oz.plymouth.edu> r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu  
(Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
In article <C78u5o.99r@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)  
writes:

>: >No, but you clearly implied that you had seen vastly more than Todd and  
>: >that your view was somehow more wide ranging than Todd's. The whole point  
>: >being that if you aren't implying that you've seen it all neither was  
>: >Todd. Therefore my assertion that your posting asserted you had some vast  
>: >knowledge base that the rest of us are not privy to is at least as valid  
>: >as your assertion regarding Todd's experiences. Apparently Todd has also  
>: >seen BOTH ENDS OF THE SPECTRUM how else could he make such comparisons.  
>:

>: Well, my friend, I wasn't making any assumption as to whether or not  
>: Todd was qualified to make such comments, I was merely pointing out  
>: that I had experience in both fields, and that I felt that I was  
>: qualified to make my own judgement. Please point out to me where I  
>: put myself over Todd by saying that I had more experience. Find  
>: any examples? I didn't think so.

>

> Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it  
>all", but if you are trying to tell me that the INTENTIONAL name  
>calling, overpowering, and overall rudeness on the HF bands are equal  
>to 11 meters, you've got to be kidding me. I was a CBer for a while  
>before I got my ticket, so I can say that I've seen both ends of the  
>spectrum.

>

>The above is pulled from one of your earlier posts. I left out the header.  
> I never claimed that you said you had more experience than Todd. I said  
>that you had \*implied\* you had seen vastly more than he. I feel that the  
>above statement from you will bear me out on that accusation.

Well, implications are subjective, and this is an  
objective argument. Once again, your argument holds no ground.  
Unless you can find a specific instance where I said that I was more  
experienced than Todd, you lose.

>: >: >: and stick pins in their cox. Never once have I seen that such actions  
>: >: >: the HF bands. Sure there's the occasional pileup, and people can be

>  
>How is suggesting that you slipped a dig at the ARRL into a post a flame.

I was suggesting that your entire post was a lame flame. Perhaps flame was an innapproiate word, how about a lame argument. You are picking apart my words, quoteing me out of context, and using arguments based on your own feelings. All in all, your arguments hold no clout. I would appricate it if you would be more objective in future posts.

This thread has taken a turn so I will resstate my origional argument. 11 meters is less mature, ruder, and overall less professional than the rest of HF. If anyone would like to continue thread on that subject, that is fine. I no longer wish to bicker over implications and out of context quotes.

Ron  
N1HIB

-----  
  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #152  
\*\*\*\*\*